



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/091,329	03/05/2002	Paul T. Bloomquist	884.724US1	7150
21186	7590	12/19/2005		
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH 1600 TCF TOWER 121 SOUTH EIGHT STREET MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			EXAMINER TRUONG, LAN DAI T	
			ART UNIT 2143	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/091,329	BLOOMQUIST ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	lan dai thi truong	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 March 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim rejections-35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chinta et al. (U.S. 6,879,995), “Chinta”, herein after

In referring to claim 12, which is exemplary of claims 13-14:

Chinta discloses a method and apparatus for performing message logging for networked applications running on an application server, comprising:

A processor: (Chinta discloses a web server, which must include a processor to implement a program: column 1, lines 31-52).

Memory coupled to the processor: (Chinta discloses “database” which is equivalent to “memory”: column 1, lines 31-52)

Server application builds a page comprising a object control information, and an initial status of the object, send the page to a client: (Chinta discloses from a web browser, a client

launches a request for a service to application server such as selecting “a particular application component” which is equivalent to “an object control information.” Upon receiving the request, the application server executes the request and returns the results to the client: column 8, lines 64-67; column 9, lines 1-10)

Queue a change in the status, and send the change to the client: (Chinta discloses method of the requesting thread may periodically poll the application server for the information regarding “the status of request” this is equivalent to “queue a change in the status.” The client then receives responses from polling process to determine if the connection with the application server is lost: column 16, lines 37-60

Claim rejections-35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Chinta et al. (U.S. 6,879,995) in view of Astarabadi et al. (U.S. 6,701,357)

In referring to claim 9:

Chinta discloses a method and apparatus for performing message logging for networked applications running on an application server, comprising:

An object: (Chinta discloses the application server receives from a client “a particular application component” which is equivalent to “an object”. The application server then determines the appropriate component, executes the request and returns the results to the client: column 8, lines 66-67; column 9, lines 1-4; column 23, lines 9-15)

A client application to poll a server for a status of the object: (Chinta discloses the application server receives a user Datagram Protocol message from client for polling request status: column 16, lines 64-67; column 17, lines 1-16)

A script application to detect the object in the page, inform the client application of the object: (Chinta discloses a client runs a web browser. The client may communicate directly with an application server via “Java Bean, Java Servlets...etc.” those program languages are script languages used to build application programs : column 1, lines 31-36; column 7, lines 38-42; column 8, lines 28-35, lines 52-67; column 9, lines 1-10).

However, Chinta does not explicitly discloses displaying the status

Astarabadi discloses a local server respond to the polling signals received from the user for status information. The local server retrieves status information from it memory and then displays the status information on the user’s display screen: (Astarabadi: column 6, lines 51-59)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Astarabadi’s ideas of displaying polling information in the user’s display screen with Chinta’s system in order to provide conveniences for the user, see ((Astarabadi: column 6, lines 1-50)

In referring to claim 10:

In addition to rejection in claim 9, Chinta – Astarabadi, further discloses the script application is interpreted by a browser: (Chinta discloses a client runs a web browser. The client may communicate directly with an application server via “Java Bean, Java Servlets...etc.” those program languages are script languages used to build application programs : column 1, lines 31-36; column 7, lines 38-42; column 8, lines 28-35, lines 52-67; column 9, lines 1-10)

Claims 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Chinta-Astarabadi in view of Robert et al. (U.S. 6,754,693)

In referring to claim 11:

In addition to rejection in claim 9, Chinta – Astarabadi, but does not explicitly teach wherein the client application is further receiving the status from the server and find a method in the script application associated with the object to execute

However, Roberts discloses method of updating the visual content of user’s browser. Robert discloses the Script language is used for communication between a service applet and user’s applet such as transmitting the changes to the user applet for displaying at user computer: abstract, lines 9-11; column 5, lines 4-11, lines 4-39)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Roberts’s ideas of using script language for updating changes to the user with Chinta- Astarabadi’s system in order to be able to monitor the communication event currently, see (Roberts: column 4, lines 39-45)

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Chinta et al. (U.S. 6,879,995) in view of LiVecchi et al. (U.S. 2001/0018701), further in view of Zhao et al. (U.S. 6,799,213)

In referring to claim 1, which is exemplary of claims 5 and 8:

Chinta discloses a method and apparatus for performing message logging for networked applications running on an application server, comprising:

Sending a request for an operation selected from a page to a server: (Chinta discloses the client runs a web browser such as the Netscape Navigator or Microsoft Internet Explorer Web browsers. From the client web browser, client sends “a request” which is equivalent to “a request for an operation” to “a web server” which is equivalent to “a server”: column 7, lines 38-41)

The page is displayed by a browser interpreting data and control information in the page: (Chinta discloses the client runs a web browser which contents “application components” which is equivalent to “control information” built up by CGI script program: column 7, lines 38-41; column 22, lines 1-10)

However, Chinta does not explicitly discloses receiving a verification whether request has received or not yet

However, LiVecchi discloses a server sends “acknowledgement” which is equivalent to “a verification” to a client to indicate that request receiving completes successfully: (LiVecchi: page 3, paragraph [0026], lines 29-31)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine LiVecchi’s ideas of sending acknowledgement to the client for indicate that request receiving completes successfully with Chinta’s system in order to be able to establish communication connection without creating a protocol error, see (LiVecchi: column 4, lines 29-31)

However, Chinta- LiVecchi does not disclose executing an application identified by the page to poll the server for a result of the operation; and receiving the result of the operation

Zhao discloses the communication between a client web browser and web server. The client sends a request for establish the connection to an application server, then the requesting thread polls for “response” which is equivalent to “result” from the application server: column 8, lines 45-50; column 9, lines 1-14)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Zhao’s ideas of polling for result with Chinta- LiVecchi’s system in order to be able to complete establishing communication connection, see (Zhao: column 8, lines 45-50)

In referring to claims 3-4 and 6-7:

In addition to rejection in claims 1 and 5, Chinta – LiVecchi- Zhao, further discloses:

Interpret the application to poll the server for the result of the operation (Zhao discloses the communication between a client web browser and application server. then the requesting thread polls for “response” which is equivalent to “result” from the application server: column 8, lines 45-50; column 9, lines 1-14)

Wherein the page comprises a link to the application: (Chinta discloses CGI program language is used to generate “HTLM content” which is equivalent to “the link to the application”. Response to user selected command, the CGI program executes the request and return results back to client browser: column 1, lines 31-52)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Zhao's ideas of polling for result with Chinta- LiVecchi's system in order to be able to monitor current status of services, see (Chinta: column 5, lines 14-17)

In referring to claim 2, the limitation:

In addition to rejection in claims 1 and 5, Chinta – LiVecchi- Zhao, further discloses the result of the operation displaying in the page: (Chinta discloses CGI program executes the user's request, and then returns "the output of program" which is equivalent to "result of operation" to "web browser" which is equivalent to "the page": column 1, lines 31-52)

Claims 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chinta et al. (U.S. 6,879,995) in view of Perholtz et al. (U.S. 5,732,212)

In referring to claim 15, which is exemplary of claims 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20:

Chinta discloses a method and apparatus for performing message logging for networked applications running on an application server, comprising:

An object: (Chinta discloses an application server receives from a client a particular "application component" which is equivalent to "an object". The application server determines the appropriate component, executes and returns the results to the client: column 8, lines 66-67; column 9, lines 1-4; column 23, lines 9-15)

A script application to detect the object in the page, inform the client application of the object: (Chinta discloses a client computer runs a web browser. The client may communicate directly with an application server via "Java Bean, Java Servlets...etc." those languages implement application programs by scripts. When the user selects particular application component, the CGI program executes the appropriate component and returns the results to the client: column 1, lines 31-36; column 7, lines 38-42; column 8, lines 28-35, lines 52-67; column 9, lines 1-10).

However Chinta does not explicitly disclose fetching a history of status of the object

Perholtz discloses method for maintaining and displaying history of status information, see (Perholtz: column 6, lines 26-49)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made combine Perholtz's ideas of storing and displaying history of status information with Chinta's system in order to provide conveniences for computer users such as analyzing system processing, and reviewing, see, (abstract: lines 1-12)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to lan dai thi truong whose telephone number is 571-272-7959. The examiner can normally be reached on monday- friday from 8:30am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lan Dai Thi Truong
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

Ldt
12/09/2005



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100